ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED FOR THE RECOGNITION OF THE STATES OF BAJA CALIFORNIA, BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR, SINALOA AND CHIHUAHUA AS LOW RISK REGIONS FOR CLASSICAL SWINE FEVER

A. PRODUCTS TO BE EXPORTED

Baja California: Pork cuts, ham, leg, sausages and viscera (TIF Plant Number 95).

Baja California Sur: At this time the state is not self sufficient in its pork production and therefore it doesn't have the possibility of exporting swine products.

Chihuahua: Primary pork cuts: loin, smoked ribs and leg (TIF Plant Number 90, Select Meats Baeza).

Sinaloa: Frozen and Vacuum packed pork cuts (TIF Plant Number 99, FAPSA and Associates, S.A. de C.V.)

B. CENSUS

Baja California: The 1998 and 1999 rural development district (D.D.R.) census is annexed at the end of the document.

Baja California Sur: The 1999-2000 rural development district (D.D.R.) census is annexed at the end of the document.

Chihuahua: The 1999 and 2000 rural development district (D.D.R.) census is annexed at the end of the document.

Sinaloa: The 1998 and 1999 census is annexed at the end of the document. In this case, the information is given by municipality, since the Federal State Delegation manifests there is a greater precision in locating the swine population in this manner, since a D.D.R may be located in more than one municipality.

C. SURVEILLANCE

1.- The surveys conducted to show that states are free of CSF were based primarily on serological sampling. What protocol was used for choosing the sample size and how were animals chosen

for sampling? What was the number of backyard herds sampled and the number of animals sampled from each herd?

Sinaloa: The method used to establish the size of the sample was the determination of the presence or absence of the disease by the Cannon and Roe formula (1982), with a confidence interval of 99% and an expected prevalence in backyard premises of 0.15%. Information on the number of premises sampled is not available, since the selected criteria were based on the total pig population that existed in the backyard premises per municipality. Therefore, the premises were randomly selected according to the number of samples assigned to each municipality taking into consideration the average of 5 pigs per backyard premises unit. The size of the sample in technically developed farms was estimated with a confidence interval of 95% and a prevalence of 10%. Then, it was randomly stratified in the following manner: 80% dams, 10% boars and 10% replacement and feeder pigs. Of the last ones, animals older than 4 months of age were sampled.

Chihuahua. From June to September of 1992, 1,789 serum samples were taken mainly at the slaughterhouses from the six municipalities that have a larger swine population. The presence of antibodies was detected and therefore in June 1993, 941 sera were taken from the municipalities in which antibodies were detected. No statistical sampling was performed as such.

Baja California: The General Animal Health Directorate determined that on the basis of a state swine census, samples would be taken from 10% of animals randomly selected of the total animals in each farm, in a total of 947 backyard premises.

Baja California Sur: A random sampling was performed in backyard swine, collecting serum samples and organs in the municipal slaughterhouse of La Paz where 99% of the total pigs of the state are slaughtered. Most of the pigs come from the La Paz and Comondú municipalities. The General Animal Health Directorate established the size of the sample.

2.- Your reply should also address the following:

a) In your statistical considerations, prevalence levels were estimated variously as 10 percent (technified farms, Sinaloa, 1993 and Chihuahua, 1997), 5 percent (technified farms, Sinaloa, 1997), 1 percent (unidentified operation type,

Sinaloa, 1997; backyard farms Chihuahua, 1997) and 0.15 percent for backyard farms (Sinaloa, 1993). What was the basis for these differences?

It is important to mention that in the years before 1996, the Federal State Delegations participated with the federal government in the establishment of the criteria for the determination of the sample size required for animal disease surveillance. Therefore in this process several technical opinions came into play.

- In the case of the state of Sinaloa, in order to establish the 10% prevalence in 1993, the fact that the commercial farms had been sampled more frequently due to the change to eradication phase and later on to liberation phase, was taken into consideration, together with the biosafety measures that were established. The number of samples estimated on that basis would be a good indication of the presence of the disease if it were present. From 1996 on, the General Animal Health Directorate determines the sample size for each free region. Added to this, in 1997, the Sinaloa producers started to participate in the surveillance in a more direct fashion, supplying more resources, and therefore the sample size was increased to have a greater degree of confidence on the absence of the classical swine fever virus.

  In relationship to "type of not identified operation", (table on page 23 of the delivered document), it is making a reference to the backyard premises in 1997, in which a 1% prevalence was estimated. In this case, as well as the 0.15% in 1993, it was taken into consideration that the pigs in this type of farms were the ones that were at a higher risk level. Therefore the criteria was to include the greatest number of backyard premises as possible, and to sample at least 5 animals or all if there were less than 5 pigs.

- In the case of the state of Chihuahua, a 10% prevalence was estimated in technically developed farms, taking into consideration that there is a small swine industry in the state and that pigs and products are supplied by free states, especially Sonora, and that there is a routine private and official surveillance of the biosafety measures that are established and of the resources that are directed to the surveillance. In the same manner as in the case of Sinaloa, the state had to comply with the established Campaign conditions in order to change from eradication phase to liberation phase. Also, it was considered necessary to obtain

a larger number of samples from the pigs that were considered at a higher risk level.

b) Technified farms were sampled to achieve a 95 percent confidence level and backyard herds to achieve a 99 percent confidence level (Sinaloa, 1993; Sinaloa and Chihuahua 1997). What was the rationale behind this difference?

In support of what was expressed in the previous answer, in backyard premises the level of confidence was raised in order to obtain a larger quantity of samples due to the risk that the ownership of said type of animal means. There are neither adequate biosafety measures nor a permanent surveillance and therefore it is difficult to detect the presence of the disease, which is the opposite of what happens in the technically developed farms where it is possible to detect the sanitary problems in an opportune manner.

c) Clinical surveillance and differential diagnosis of sick pigs played a major role in confirming that the United States was free of CSF. What role, if any, did this type of surveillance play in Chihuahua, Sinaloa, Baja California and Baja California Sur?

In general, the surveillance was previously just passive and therefore the samples came from diseased swine with respiratory or enteric signs of disease. Therefore the clinical surveillance and the differential diagnosis of the samples from diseased pigs has played an important role in the liberation of the states as well as the maintenance of the free status.

3.- Surveys were conducted in Baja California and Baja California Sur in 1994. What sampling methods were used and what were the results?

They were not made under a specific method. The Federal State Delegations determined the collection of samples in the following manner:

Baja California/1994:

The sampling consisted of the submission of 483 sera to the laboratory. These were collected in municipal and TIF slaughterhouses and they came from technically developed swine farms and backyard premises with 100% negative results.

Baja California Sur/1994:

A serological sampling in the municipal slaughterhouse and backyard premises in the municipality of La Paz was performed in the following manner:

Samples	Slaughterhouses			Backyard Premises		
	Total	(+)	(-)	Total	(+)	(-)
Sera	751	2	749	412	4	408
Organs	4	1	3	26	9	17

The detection of positive samples originated the deployment of an operative that is detailed in the corresponding Outbreak Chapter.

4.- Have you conducted surveys which are not documented in these reports? If so, what methods were used and what results were obtained?

The methodology that was used was the following:

In all cases, in the four states, for the estimate of the sample size in technically developed farms and backyard premises the Cannon and Roe formula (1982) was used, with a 95% level of confidence. An expected prevalence of 1% in the backyard premises and 5% in the technically developed farms in Baja California, Baja California Sur and Sinaloa. In Chihuahua, due to the amount of resources that were granted for the samplings for this disease, 10% prevalence for technically developed farms was decided, since they have the adequate biosafety measures in place. More resources were then directed towards the swine population in backyard premises since it was considered at a greater risk level.

In the case of complete cycle farms, 80% of the samples come from dams, 10% from the boars and 10% come from the feeder pigs that were older than 4 months of age.

Five samples were taken, or of all the animals if there were less animals in the backyard premises. The sampling was randomly performed, without taking into consideration if the animals were confined or free roaming.

The size of the sample in each state is shown in the following tables:

BAJA CALIFORNIA

	1997		1998		1999	
Production type	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed
Technically Developed Farms	767	667	767	1,080	767	708
Backyard Premises	1,470	1,571	1,470	1,545	1,470	1,364
TOTAL	2,237	2,238	2,237	2,625	2,237	2,072

In all the cases the results were negative.

BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR

	1997		1998		1999	
Production type	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed
Technically Developed Farms	58	58	58	58	58	58
Backyard Premises	1,495	2,193	1,495	1,688	1,495	2,635
TOTAL	1,553	2,251	1,553	1,746	1,553	2,693

In all the cases the results were negative.

CHIHUAHUA

	1997		1998		1999	
Production type	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed
Technically Developed Farms	232	233	232	232	232	232
Backyard Premises	1,492	1,520	1,498	1,527	1,498	1,471
TOTAL	1,724	1,753	1,730	1,759	1,730	1,703

In all the cases the results were negative.

SINALOA

	1997		1998		1999	
Production type	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed	Sample Size	Samples Analyzed
Technically Developed Farms	1,534	1,523	1,534	1,388	1,534	1,534
Backyard Premises	1,495	1,495	1,495	1,527	1,495	1,617
TOTAL	3,029	3,018	3,029	1,759	3,029	3,151

Note: in 1998 three farms that were included in the 1997 inventory were withdrawn.

In all the cases the results were negative.

5.- Most backyard animals appear to be slaughtered on the farm. How are such samples selected, collected, and randomized for incorporation into survey data?

It is important to mention that these animals are raised for home consumption, and therefore they are sacrificed *in situ* and are consumed in the same place for special family events. In this case, it is not possible to take samples, since the animals are totally consumed.

When in the backyard premises dead animals are found, samples are taken of organs routinely in order to make a differential diagnosis for classical swine fever. If there are diseased pigs these are included in the sampling.

Blood sera are taken from live animals for the active surveillance of backyard premises. Five samples are randomly taken or 100% of the animals if they are less than five.

6.- Is slaughter surveillance conducted? If so, how are animals sampled and how is the number of samples determined?

In some free states, samples are collected at the slaughterhouse in support of the active surveillance, the number of samples is determined in relationship with the average of monthly slaughter. The samples are sera and they are collected at the time of slaughter. In the case that the presence of the disease is suspected in the farm, tonsils are collected, in the farm or in the slaughterhouse for follow-up.

The Federal State Delegations reported the following:

Baja California: A blood sample is taken at the time of beheading, and serum is obtained from it, these samples are incorporated to the size of the sample that has been established.

Baja California Sur: Samples are taken at the moment the animals are beheaded. A fixed sample size was established that corresponds to 10% of the annual slaughter sacrifice volume.

Chihuahua: With the support of the veterinarians responsible of the municipal slaughterhouses, samples are taken directly from the bloodletting of the animal. These are generally included in the sample size.

Sinaloa: Sampling does not take place in the slaughterhouses.

7.- What diagnostic test(s) was (were) used and what tissues were sampled?

Immunoperoxidase, ELISA, seroneutralization and viral isolation techniques are used with the purpose of detecting evidence of Classical Swine Fever in the sera samples. In the case of organ samples, those are worked simultaneously by direct immunofluorescence, viral isolation (cell culture) and bacteriology in tonsils, spleen, and nodules (points 7.3.1. and 8 of the Mexican Official Standard NOM-037-ZOO-1995, National Campaign Against Classical Swine Fever).

8.- Aside from surveys targeted for CSF, how many samples does each state submit each year to the reference laboratories or to CENASA for routine, general surveillance? What type of samples are submitted (e.g. slaughter hogs, breeding animals, cull hogs)? What action is taken if the diagnosis is equivocal?

Samples	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999*
For other swine diseases	2,614	1,773	2,663	2,485	1,718
For CSF diagnosis	3,305	1,837	2,664	2,485	1,720

*Up to August

Notwithstanding the zootechnical function of the animals, the samples come in the first place from sick or suspected pigs and after that from healthy animals. The type of samples is mainly

sera and organs (in case the disease is suspected), according to point 7.3.1. and 8 of the Mexican Official Standard NOM-037-ZOO-1995, National Campaign against Classical Swine Fever.

The procedure to be followed when the laboratory reports a positive result is the epidemiological research of the case and that includes the following:

- Identification of the premises of origin
- Precautionary quarantine
- Repeat sampling of the existing animals
- Visit of neighboring premises, inquiries and samplings

In the positive diagnosed cases (serology evidence), other tests are performed such as: ELISA, viral seroneutralization, immunofluorescence and viral isolation, in order to confirm the diagnosis. In the case that the samples are sent from free states directly to CENASA, this laboratory upon finding a positive result, shall immediately send a portion of the sample to the CPA laboratory for confirmation. In the case of positive result in some approved laboratory, a sample is sent in parallel to CENASA and CPA for confirmation. If there is a positive serum in any other additional test, the destruction of all animals that are considered under risk is performed, even if there is no suggestive clinical evidence.

In the case that the laboratory diagnosis is negative, if surveillance follow-up shows suspicious clinical evidence, the animals are sampled again and double samples are sent to CENASA and CPA.

What explanation is available for the large number of suspicious samples identified for all laboratories in Mexico in 1995 (16,239) in comparison to other years (range of 594 to 856 between 1992 and 1996)?

It is important to mention that the samples were suspected of having diverse diseases, of the ones called "red diseases of swine". In 1995, there were many of these suspected diseases and only 366 resulted positive to immunoperoxidase. Most of the samples came from control phase states, with the exception of Baja California Sur that had an outbreak during that year and that is described in detail below.

C.- OUTBREAK HISTORY

1.- Have any outbreaks been detected in the states under evaluation since the time the reports you provided previously were submitted? If so, how was the disease traced back to its source? What steps were taken to ensure that the outbreaks did not recur?

In the State of Baja California Sur there has been three CSF outbreaks. One occurred in May 1993 and it is described in the document "Characterization of the Baja California Sur State for the International Recognition as a Free from Classical Swine Fever Zone" of the month of June 1994. A second outbreak appeared in 1994 and the third in 1995. These last two are detailed below.

In November 1994, a slaughterhouse was detected that had positive sera in animals from backyard premises. Immediately a follow up was performed to trace the origin. The animals came from one lot in the Col. Marquez de Leon situated on the outskirts of La Paz. DINESA established the emergency operative in order to eradicate the virus, by the slaughter of all the pigs in that place, and the producers were compensated. The zone was quarantined and all surveillance measures including mobilization were strengthened. Sampling was intensified in the slaughterhouse during six months, and the results were negative.

On the 17th of October 1995 CENASA notified CPA that there were 2 CSF positive sera that came from the municipality of Los Cabos, B.C.S. DINESA personnel thus implemented the operative that included activities such as a program of inspection, sampling, diagnosis and quarantine. The positive sera corresponded to backyard premises in two sites close to San Jose del Cabo, 3 Km from the airport and close to the municipal dump. During the investigation it was confirmed that no mobilization of pigs or their products was made outside of this area.

A five-Km focal zone and a 20-Km perifocal zone were established. Within, 161 backyard premises with a total of 1,300 pigs were sampled, of which twenty-eight backyard premises with 326 pigs had positive serology and/or symptoms suggestive of CSF in 32 animals. These animals were destroyed, and the producers compensated.

After that a serological sampling was performed that included the rest of the premises in the municipality where there was neither clinical nor serological evidence of the disease. This operative was concluded in November of that same year.

In order to avoid a recurrence of a CSF outbreak, the Federal Livestock State Sub-delegation of the Ministry investigated the origin of the swine products that supplied the needs of the area, basically hotels and restaurants. Routine visits were implemented in inspection offices in airports and seaports in order to reinforce the surveillance of swine products and by-products that came in through airplanes and ships. Also the use of food scraps in feeding of pigs was avoided in the region. At the same time the repopulation of swine close to the municipal dump was banned.

2.- What, if any, outbreaks of disease have been detected in states adjacent to the four under consideration in the last two years? If outbreaks were detected, what steps were taken to ensure that disease was not introduced into Chihuahua, Sinaloa, Baja California and Baja California Sur? What is the current disease status of all adjoining states?

The only outbreak that was detected occurred in the state of Durango. On the 12th of August 1998, the CAIPEL laboratory reported the Durango Federal State Agency reported a positive sample by immunoperoxidase that came from the municipality of Santiago Papasquiaro, Dgo. and therefore the operative was activated and the following countermeasures were implemented:

- Location of the focus
- Epidemiological investigation interviews
- Background of the signs
- Slaughter and necropsy of two animals that were affected
- Sera and organs were sampled and sent to be processed in CENASA.

On the 17th of August the samples were confirmed as positive to CSF and therefore the total amount of animals in the affected communities (Salpica El Agua and Salsipuedes) were slaughtered and buried. The pigpens were cleaned, disinfected and fumigated. Samples were taken in the (5-Km) focal and (20-Km)

perifocal areas, and they were sent to CENASA for diagnosis and they were all negative.

The emergency operative concluded on the 7th of September 1998. From that date on 40 sentinel pigs were placed in the communities in order to corroborate the absence of the disease, collecting serological samples every 15 days. They were all negative to the presence of CSF.

It must be perfectly clear that the state was in CSF eradication phase. It was officially liberated of that disease on the 7th of October 1999. The presence of the disease or positive serology hasn't been found again in the state of Durango.

The Federal State Delegation notified the rest of the states of the presence of the disease in the region in order to avoid the movement of the disease into these states. Therefore, the epidemiological surveillance and the control of pigs, their products and by-products mobilization into the neighboring states were reinforced.

Sonora, Coahuila, Durango and Nayarit are at the present time free from the disease.

D.- FINANCIAL RESOURCES

1.- The CSF Campaign budgets by state (1996-1997) from the Livestock Production Sub-delegation were reduced significantly for both Sinaloa and Chihuahua in comparison to the budgets by state reported for 1993-1995. In fact funds were reduced from $569,000 for 1995 to $12,000 for 1996 in Chihuahua and from $317,000 for 1995 to $24,000 for 1996 in Sinaloa. What was the reason for this large reduction in budget within a 1-year period?

To answer this question it is necessary to state that from 1996 on, the program called Agricultural Alliance (Alianza para el Campo) began. From 1995 on the federal and state governments within the framework of the 1995-2000 Development Plan signed coordination agreements. The state governments annually get together with the federal government to establish the amount allotted to the program of Agricultural Alliance. One of the components of this program is the animal health program.

The work plan, as well as the resources, in equal contributions, are defined by the federal state agencies and the state governments and the Animal Promotion and Protection Committees (most of them are producers) according to the priorities in the state for each national campaign. The three parties sign this and it is included in the technical annexes of the animal health program.

Generally, there are fewer resources allotted when the state is free of a campaign disease, since there are less campaign activities. The activities then are reduced to the permanent surveillance to verify the fact that the state remains free.

2.- No CSF funds were allocated to Baja California and Baja California Sur in 1993. Were funds allocated in subsequent years? What resources are available currently to detect and control disease in these states?

There has always been a general budget for all of the animal health areas within which the national zoosanitary campaigns are included. Each state establishes the amount of resources given to each one of them according to their priorities.

Baja California: Yes, funds were granted for CSF during the following years, the resources were given in the form of financing, materials, laboratory equipment, vehicles and fuel to perform the surveillance activities.

Baja California Sur: In 1999, $103,040.00 were granted for surveillance activities in slaughterhouses, backyard premises, for the payment of materials necessary for sampling and the payment of the laboratory sample analysis.

E.- LIVESTOCK DEMOGRAPHICS

1.- What proportion of the animals in markets, stockyards, and slaughter facilities originate from backyard herds?

Baja California: 90% of the animals comes from backyard premises. In the state there are neither animal markets nor auctions.

Baja California Sur: In the state there are neither markets nor auctions where pigs may concur. Almost all pigs that get into the slaughterhouses come from backyard premises, with the

exception of those that are introduced by two technically developed farms that exist in the state.

Chihuahua: 90% of the animals comes from backyard premises, since this type of swine production represent the majority of the production according to the state census.

Sinaloa: The municipal slaughterhouses do not sacrifice swine from backyard premises. Approximately 20% of the animals from backyard premises are sacrificed in slaughterhouses and the population that lives in the premises uses the other 80% for family consumption and it is sacrificed *in situ.* There aren't animal markets or auctions.

2.- Are animals from backyard herds allowed to commingle with commercial animals at markets, stockyards, or slaughter facilities?

Baja California: It is not allowed.

Baja California Sur: Every pig that is introduced into slaughterhouses is sacrificed on the same day it is introduced, and therefore at that moment the direct contact between backyard premises and commercial swine is possible.

Chihuahua: It is not allowed

Sinaloa: It is not allowed.

F.- IMPORT CONTROLS

When a state enters the CSF eradication phase, the Animal Health Directorate General instructs airlines to replace pork products on the menu with poultry. What measures are taken to address this issue for commercial and pleasure boats coming into the relevant states requesting status recognition?

The ports of commercial and tourist importance are Topolobampo, Sinaloa and Pichilingue, Baja California Sur. The merchandise in Topolobampo comes basically from the state of Sonora. Tourist ships arrive at the Pichilingue port and they come from Sonora, Sinaloa, U.S.A and Canada. Therefore, the swine products that could arrive here would come from CSF free areas.

The information that was sent by the Federal State Delegations is the following:

Baja California: In the state there is a strict and permanent program of surveillance and inspections in order to restrict the entrance of pigs, products and by-products, according to the guidelines established by the General Animal Health Directorate and the corresponding Mexican Official Standards.

Baja California Sur: Commercial ship passengers and cargo are inspected. The menus of these ships are prepared with products bought in the state. In the case of tourist ships, a careful inspection is performed of ship's holds and food cannot be disembarked. Also most of these foods come from the United States.

Sinaloa: In the state there are two seaports: Mazatlan and Topolobampo. In the first one, there is technical support personnel in the inspection office of Mazatlan that is ascribed to CONASAG and technical personnel (inspectors) in the Rural Development District (DDR) in Mazatlan. In the Topolobampo seaport there is personnel of CONASAG in the Topolobampo inspection office and technical staff of the DDR in Los Mochis. In both seaports, this personnel is in charge of the inspection of ships that come to the state in order to avoid the entrance of swine products that represent a sanitary risk.

G.- EMERGENCY RESPONSE CAPABILITY

What official documentation is available which describes the role of state level response groups (GEESA's) in emergency responses? Do other organizations participate in this effort? If so, what are their roles and responsibilities?

In the case of an animal health emergency, the presence of an outbreak of a foreign disease either for the country or a free state, the National Animal Health Emergency Mechanism (DINESA) is activated immediately, its function is the control and eradication of foreign diseases.

One of the priority activities of DINESA, is the establishment of the State Animal Health Emergency Groups (GEESA). To become part of a GEESA a simulate situation course on foreign animal diseases is given to select state veterinary doctors. In the following phase a second course is given to those participants

that showed in the first course the organization, leadership, and good decision making under pressure abilities.

The function of a GEESA is to act under the supervision of DINESA personnel in order to help quickly, efficaciously and in an organized manner in animal health emergencies. Up until now a total of 29 state groups have been formed with 931 veterinarians in the country.

The following table shows the distribution of the GEESA's in the CSF free states:

STATE	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
Baja California	15
Baja California Sur	13
Sonora	23
Chihuahua	32
Coahuila	17
Comarca Lagunera	28
Durango	26
Nuevo Leon	35
Tamaulipas	98
Sinaloa	19
Nayarit	25
Yucatán, Campeche and Quintana Roo	39
TOTAL	**370**

The members of the GEESA groups are personnel of the federal government, state governments, federal state delegations, Animal Promotion and Protection Committees and private organized producers and private veterinarians

Other organizations that may participate in this effort if the state and federal government capacity is surpassed, are the Animal Promotion and Protection Committees and private organized producers and veterinarians associations, as well other ministries of the federal government may participate in a national emergency.

A copy of the Agreement that establishes within the Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources the National Animal Health Emergency System, published in the Official Federal Gazette on the 16th of February 1988 is annexed. Article 2nd mentions the creation of the GEESA groups (at that time GRESA).

H.- BAJA CALIFORNIA AND BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR

1.- In 1994, Baja California had three TIF plants, two of which slaughtered hogs and one whose activities included further processing. Is this still accurate? Since the state is not a large producer of hogs, what is the source of pigs for these TIF slaughter plants?

At the present time, Baja California has 2 active TIF plants where swine that come from the same state are slaughtered.

2.- In 1994, there were no accredited veterinarians in Baja California. Is this statement still accurate? If so, how does pork from this state enter interstate or international commerce?

There are no CSF approved veterinarians. The surveillance is performed through official veterinarians from the Federal State Delegation of SAGAR.

Pork from this state is not marketed internationally In the case of animal mobilization within or outside of the state, besides complying with the Mexican Official Standards, a zoosanitary certificate is required (detailed below). This document is necessary to allow the introduction of animals from one state into another. In the case of the importation of live animals or their products, it is necessary that the specifications contained in the zoosanitary requirements sheet issued by the SAGAR are complied with.

3.- In 1994, there were no federal TIF plants or accredited veterinarians in Baja California Sur. Is this statement still accurate? ? If so, how does pork from this state enter interstate or international commerce?

In the state there are neither TIF plants nor CSF approved veterinarians.

It is important that we underline that the state does not market pigs to other states and does not export towards other countries; it only imports breeding animals that come from the state of Sonora. The pigs are slaughtered in the municipal slaughterhouses that the state has and the official veterinary doctors that are part of the personnel perform the ante and post mortem inspections.

The mobilization of animals within or outsize of the state requires the zoosanitary certificate and that the Mexican Official Standards be complied with.

4.- In 1994, TIF plants in Baja California and Baja California Sur issued sanitary waybills for trace-back. Are sanitary waybills still used? If so, what do these sanitary waybills specify?

In Baja California Sur there are no TIF plants. At the present time sanitary guides are no longer used for this purpose, they had been replaced by the zoosanitary certificates. The zoosanitary certificate is the official document that is issued by the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Rural Development or by those persons specifically approved for the mobilization of animals, their products and by-products. The Ministry issues said certificates through the Federal State Delegations and in some cases through other places such as the DDR, rural development support centers or the zoosanitary inspection offices. The official veterinarians are the ones specifically authorized to sign said documents.

Now, there are five certification organisms, each one of them has a series of zoosanitary certification centers that are distributed throughout the country. In this case, the approved veterinary doctors for the control of mobilization of animals, their products and by-products are the ones that sign the zoosanitary certificates.

There is a federal random verification program for the certification organisms and their centers. Also these organisms shall begin internal programs in order to supervise their own centers.

The verification of the certification organisms is carried out at the central level by the official veterinarians of the DGSA. Likewise the certification centers are verified by official personnel of the Federal State Delegations of the SAGAR.

The SAGAR may verify the compliance in the proper use of the certificate through the consecutive numbers of the document, since there is a strict control of the numbers that are printed and given to each one of the organisms and Federal State Delegations. It is important to underline that the five zoosanitary certification centers have internal controls that identify the numbers that are given to the zoosanitary

certification centers, and the numbers of the copies of these centers return to the same certification organism once the zoosanitary certificate is issued.

The certificate has an original and three copies. The user gets the original, one copy is kept at the certification center, another at the approved certification organism and another is sent to the Livestock State Sub-delegation. In this fashion, it is possible to detect any duplication of the sequenced numbers.

In the same manner, the zoosanitary certificates have a special mark that allows the General Animal Health Directorate to identify in specific cases the authenticity of the documents.

On the other hand, in the control points or plant and animal inspection booths a verification of all documentation is performed. In such cases everything must have a direct relationship with the data on the zoosanitary certificate or else animals, products or by-products are retained at these booths.

The certification organisms are approved only once, and after that the approval is renewed every 2 or 3 years. The zoosanitary certification centers are authorized in an individual manner and said authorization ends when the certification organism ends. At the present time, veterinarians are approved each year.

The zoosanitary certificate has the following data:

1. Name and address of the owner
2. Data of the farm of origin
3. Data of the addressee
4. Type of product or by-product that shall be mobilized
5. Species it belongs to
6. Reason for the mobilization and quantity
7. Data of the carrier
8. Name and signature of the veterinarian that is responsible
9. Date in force

This document allows, if it were the case, to trace back the origin of swine products.

I MISCELLANEOUS

Please provide English translations for the latest revisions of the following documents:

a) Norms for Federal Accreditation Program Area (NOM-018-ZOO-1994)
b) National Hog Cholera Campaign Norm (NOM-037-ZOO-1995), which supersedes NOM-EM-012-ZOO-1994

The requested English translations of the documents are annexed.

SWINE INVENTORY

BAJA CALIFORNIA SUR

1999-2000

	TECHNIFIED POPULATION		SEMI-TECHNIFIED POPULATION		BACKYARD POPULATION	
R.D.D.	NUMBER OF FARMS	NUMBER OF PIGS PER FARM	NUMBER OF FARMS	NUMBER OF PIGS PER FARM	NUMBER OF PREMISES	NUMBER OF PIGS PER BACKYARD PREMISE
Mulegé	0	0	0	0	411	1,235
Comondú	0	0	0	0	558	11,154
La Paz	1	1,100	1	123	255	4,086
Los Cabos	0	0	0	0	617	4.075
TOTAL	1	1,100	1	123	1,841	20,550

SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA, GANADERIA Y DESARROLLO RURAL
DELEGACION ESTATAL EN BAJA CALIFORNIA
SUBDELEGACION AGROPECUARIA
PROGRAMA DE SALUD ANIMAL

SWINE INVENTORY

BAJA CALIFORNIA

RURAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT	TECHNIFIED POPULATION		SEMI-TECHNIFIED POPULATION		BACKYARD POPULATION	
	NUMBER OF FARMS	NUMBER OF PIGS PER FARM	NUMBER OF FARMS	NUMBER OF PIGS PER FARM	NUMBER OF FARMS	NUMBER OF PIGS PER BACKYARD PREMISE
001-ENSENADA						
1998	7	9,084	9	308	142	3,081
1999	5	5,455	12	1,303	142	3,597
Sub-total	12	14,539	21	2,211	288	6,678
002-RIO COLORADO						
1998	6	7,365	21	1,499	30	661
1999	6	10,606	28	2,159	36	951
Valle Mexicali						
San Luis Rio Colorado, Sonora					63	852
Sub-total	12	17,971	49	3,658	129	2,464
TOTAL	24	32,510	70	5,869	417	9,142

SWINE INVENTORY

CHIHUAHUA 1999

#	RDD	NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL FARMS	NUMBER OF HEADS	NUMBER OF. BACKYARD PREMISES	NUMBER OF HEADS
1	NUEVO CASAS GRANDES			1,756	8,778
2	BUENAVENTURA			76	378
3	EL CARMEN	1	200	953	4,763
4	VALLE DE JUAREZ	1	200	678	3,390
5	MADERA			1,446	7,230
6	CUAUHTEMOC	1	30	5,682	28,410
7	PAPIGOCHI			982	4,911
8	CHIHUAHUA	3	200	2,997	14,987
9	BAJO RIO CONCHOS			208	1,041
10	SAN JUANITO			10,685	53,426
11	BALLEZA			2,035	10,176
12	PARRAL	1	200	669	3,346
13	DELICIAS	1	90	14,465	72,327
14	RIO FLORIDO			3,081	15,405
	TOTAL	**8**	**920**	**45,714**	**228,568**

SWINE INVENTORY

CHIHUAHUA 2000

#	RDD	NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL FARMS	NUMBER OF HEADS	NUMBER OF BACKYARD PREMISES	NUMBER OF HEADS
1	NUEVO CASAS GRANDES			1,756	9,539
2	BUENAVENTURA			76	460
3	EL CARMEN	1	1,280	953	2,350
4	VALLE DE JUAREZ			678	13,000
5	MADERA	1	256	1,446	10,035
6	CUAUHTEMOC	1	192	5,682	29,530
7	PAPIGOCHI			982	5,057
8	CHIHUAHUA	1	128	2,997	14,271
9	BAJO RIO CONCHOS			208	900
10	SAN JUANITO			10,685	15,523
11	BALLEZA			2,035	7,838
12	PARRAL			669	1,115
13	DELICIAS	1	570	14,465	51,863
14	RIO FLORIDO			3,081	7,702
	TOTAL	**5**	**2,626**	**45,714**	**169,183**

SWINE INVENTORY
SINALOA 1998

MUNICIPALITY	NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL FARMS	NUMBER OF HEADS	NUMBER OF BACKYARD PREMISES	NUMBER OF HEADS
AHOME	6	22,930	2,082	12,550
ANGOSTURA	1	1,390	1,407	8,000
BADIRAGUATO			1,890	9,850
CHOIX			1,510	10,210
CONCORDIA			934	10,200
COSALA			867	8,900
CULIACAN	7	17,480	4,628	78,000
ELOTA			1,339	15,500
ESCUINAPA			1,052	10,800
EL FUERTE	5	30,559	1,994	12,570
GUASAVE	3	7,324	4,224	23,500
MAZATLAN			1,060	15,000
MOCORITO			1,817	10,310
NAVOLATO	4	14,778	1,493	13,000
ROSARIO			1,642	11,000
S. ALVARADO			522	10,300
SAN IGNACIO			1,002	11,900
SINALOA			4,073	13,024
TOTAL	**26**	**94,821**	**33,536**	**284,614**

SWINE INVENTORY
SINALOA 1999

MUNICIPALITY	NUMBER OF COMMERCIAL FARMS	NUMBER OF HEADS	NUMBER OF BACKYARD PREMISES	NUMBER OF HEADS
AHOME	6	22,930	2,082	12,550
ANGOSTURA	1	1,390	1,407	8,000
BADIRAGUATO			1,890	9,850
CHOIX			1,510	10,210
CONCORDIA			934	10,200
COSALA			867	8,900
CULIACAN	7	17,480	4,628	78,000
ELOTA			1,339	15,500
ESCUINAPA			1,052	10,800
EL FUERTE	5	30,559	1,994	12,570
GUASAVE	2	4,573	4,224	23,500
MAZATLAN			1,060	15,000
MOCORITO			1,817	10,310
NAVOLATO	4	14,778	1,493	13,000
ROSARIO			1,642	11,000
S. ALVARADO			522	10,300
SAN IGNACIO			1,002	11,900
SINALOA			4,073	13,024
TOTAL	**25**	**92,070**	**33,536**	**284,614**